

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>SOLOMON L. WALKER, et al.,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:05-CV-0963</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>HENKELS &amp; McCOY and</b>	:	
<b>RUSSEL N. WHITSEL,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 6th day of February, 2007, upon consideration of the motion (Doc. 34) for reconsideration filed by defendant Henkels & McCoy, and the court finding that the motion for reconsideration was not timely filed,<sup>1</sup> see L.R. 7.10 (“Any motion for reconsideration or reargument shall be filed within ten (10) days after the entry of judgment, *order* or decree concerned.”) (emphasis added), and that there are no manifest errors of law or fact in the challenged memorandum and order, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) (“The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence . . .”), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 34) for reconsideration is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> The challenged memorandum and order (Doc. 31) was entered on December 20, 2006. The instant motion for reconsideration (Doc. 34) was filed more than forty days later on February 2, 2007.